

From: Philip J Riley
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Tue, Feb 11.2003 3:19 PM
Subject: Comments to the Cornmissioner

Philip J Riley (philip_j_riley@yahoo.com) writes:

I currently work for Verizon. I am a low man on the totem pole. I am not management. Let me explain to you what I see happening here because of these network sharing rules.

2000-2002 I was installing millions of dollars worth of equipment and infastructure. so that other companies could interface with us @ wholesale rates. These CLECS have no saftey procedures, and hire just anyone to haphazardly construct steel supports @ power cabling. The CLEC cages meet absolutely no fire/safety/construction codes whatsoever. Then half of them go out of buisness, and we have all this interfacing infastructure that was forced to be built, and only getting wholesale income from half of it. The installation department then declares a surplus, and many of us are forced to leave or switch departments.

2002-present - Now I work in the Verzon Data department. There are entire companies with no infastructure whatsoever, that are re-selling our data lines @ a discount because we HAVE to let them buy in bulk @ wholesale rates. Then, everytirne there is a line trouble, they tell us that the end equipment has been verified to be working properly. We spend hours testing the circuit, dispatching, co-ordinating, only to find out the customer's equipment was un-plugged. There is no benifit to the customer in service, as it all has to come to us anyway. So we chase their troubles, we **do** their testing and we build and maintain their network. **All** they do **is** make phone calls. What a rip-off. I just saw 5 GOOD workers get layed off from my department, and I am the next in line. I can't stand here and watch this anymore.

In UNE-P. the p should stand for Parasite. If companies want to compete, they should build their own network. Would Ford ever be FORCED to supply GM with factories, parts, and labor @ a wholesale rate? NEVER It makes no sense. This is killing investment and killing jobs. Please, open your eyes.

You are more then welcome to come to 185 Franklin St. Boston, and spend a day talking to us

Philip J. Riley

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 159.67.20.40
Remote IP address: 159.67.20.40

From: Philip Peck
To: Philip Peck
Date: Tue. Feb 11, 2003 4:47 PM
Subject: Proposed FCC Changes Cost Consumers

Message sent to the following recipients:

Senator Lautenberg

Senator Corzine

Representative Ferguson

Message text follows:

Philip Peck
16 Highview Dr
Woodbridge, NJ 07095-3905

February 11, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

[recipient name was inserted here].

(732) 602-1240

Sincerely,

Philip M. Peck

From: Pieter Geldermans
To: Pieter Geldermans
Date: Tue, Feb 11, 2003 9:44 PM
Subject: Proposed FCC Changes Cost Consumers

Message sent to the following recipients:

Senator Levin

Senator Stabenow

Representative Ehlers

Message text follows:

Pieter Geldermans
2105 Raybrook SE Apt. 1038
Grand Rapids, MI 49546

February 11, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

[recipient name was inserted here].

The Federal Communications Commission is considering taking actions that will restrict consumer choice by deregulating local phone service.

Millions of Americans like me could have their phone service threatened if the local phone companies aren't required to allow competitors access to the market. I'm also concerned about the Commission's move to relieve all broadband Internet access facilities of open access obligations.

Both of these key decisions will limit my choices as a consumer by lessening competition, diminishing cost savings and threatening consumer protections. **As** a constituent, I urge you to support competition and open access for local phone service.

Sincerely,

Pieter Geldermans

From: Ralph Randau
To: Ralph Randau
Date: Tue, Feb 11, 2003 4:31 PM
Subject: Proposed FCC Changes Cost Consumers

Message sent to the following recipients:

Senator Feinstein

Senator Boxer

Representative Cunningham

Message text follows:

Ralph Randau
1739 Greentree Rd.
Encinitas, CA 92024

February 11, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

[recipient name was inserted here],

The Federal Communications Commission is considering taking actions that will restrict consumer choice by deregulating local phone service.

Millions of Americans like me could have their phone service threatened if the local phone companies aren't required to allow competitors access to the market. I'm also concerned about the Commission's move to relieve all broadband Internet access facilities of open access obligations.

Both of these key decisions will limit my choices as a consumer by lessening competition, diminishing cost savings and threatening consumer protections. As a constituent, I urge you to support competition and open access for local phone service.

Sincerely,

Ralph R. Randau

From: Rick Garnber
To: Mike Powell
Date: Tue. Feb 11.2003 4:10 PM
Subject: UNE-P Comments

Chairman Powell

Attached as a word document please find our comments relative to the UNE-P issue. Thank you for your consideration.

Rick Garnber
Michigan Consumer Federation

Michigan Consumer Federation
4990 Northwind Drive, Ste. 225
East Lansing, MI 48823
 517 324 9930

February 11, 2003

Dear Chairman Powell and Commissioners Abernathy, Adelstein, Copps and Marlin:

Almost seven years after Congress passed the groundbreaking Telecommunication Act, the promise of real local phone competition is finally starting to become a reality for consumers in Michigan.

According to the most recent data released by your agency, new market entrants provide service to more than eighteen percent of local telephone lines in Michigan, a dramatic increase from only three percent in December 1999. As a result, hundreds of thousands of Michigan residents are now benefiting from greater choice and better pricing in local phone service. In fact, SBC customers in Michigan are finally seeing rates start to go down rather than up – something that hasn't happened in years.

However, just as competition begins to take hold, we understand that the Commission is considering a proposal that would significantly scale back or even eliminate the very regulations – known as Unbundled Network Element Platform, or UNE-P – that have played a critical role in promoting the recent surge in local phone competition.

Were the Commission to initiate such a major reversal of policy, all the progress that has been made in Michigan to bring real local phone competition to residential markets would be reversed. In fact, 90% of those customers who have chosen an alternative to SBC would see rate increases that would drive them back to the incumbent provider, ending all of the gains in competitive choices. Once again, consumers would be stuck with little or no choice, and the savings and service improvements that accompany increased competition would quickly evaporate.

Rather than adopting policies that would only serve to undermine telecom competition, we urge the Commission to demonstrate its commitment to the interests of consumers, and the future of competition, by reaffirming your support for UNE-P.

Indeed, according to a report issued recently by the National Association of State Utility Consumer Advocates, the continued existence of UNE-P is vital to the future of local competition in local markets across the country.

The report found that in many markets, market entrants who rely on the UNE-P system

1

serve the vast majority of residential and small business consumers who have switched their local phone service to a new competitor. In Texas, for example, competitors that depend on UNE-P provide service to 77 percent of switched customers. Without the current UNE-P structure, the report concludes, "it is unlikely that even the limited amount of residential competition that exists today could survive."

It is also critical that the Commission preserve the position of state regulators in maintaining and promoting competition in our telecom markets. State utility regulators like the Michigan Public Service Commission have played a vital part in opening local telephone markets across the country up to competition, and we believe that they are best placed to make decisions that impact local markets.

For local phone competition to continue to develop and flourish, state authorities must continued to have the flexibility to carry out their Congressionally mandated role of keeping local telephone markets open, and setting fair UNE-P prices.

Moreover, the Commission proposals that limit open access to communications networks, including fiber networks, are wrongheaded. Without open, non-discriminatory access to broadband networks, consumers will not realize the full potential of the Internet. Recent FCC decisions on broadband access policy threaten to inhibit innovation and consumer choice in the high-speed Internet marketplace.

The Federal Communications Commission has both an obligation and a responsibility to protect the public interest, and promote the interests of consumers. If the FCC opts to abandon the pro-competition UNE-P and broadband framework established by the Telecom Act, just as it begins to deliver real savings and benefits to ordinary consumers, it will have failed on both counts.

We thank you for your consideration of these important issues.

Sincerely,

Rick Gamber
Executive Director

From: Robert Maples
To: Robert Maples
Date: Tue, Feb 11, 2003 4:36 PM
Subject: Proposed FCC Changes Cost Consumers

Message sent to the following recipients:

Senator Graham
Senator Nelson
Representative Brown-Waite
Message text follows:

Robert Maples
28340 Skyline Dr.
Leesburg, FL 34748-8593

February 11, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

[recipient name was inserted here],

The Federal Communications Commission is considering taking actions that will restrict consumer choice by deregulating local phone service.

Millions of Americans like me could have their phone service threatened if the local phone companies aren't required to allow competitors access to the market. I'm also concerned about the Commission's move to relieve all broadband Internet access facilities of open access obligations.

Both of these key decisions will limit my choices as a consumer by lessening competition, diminishing cost savings and threatening consumer protections. As a constituent, I urge you to support competition and open access for local phone service.

Sincerely,

Robert Maples

From: robert minich
To: robert minich
Date: Tue, Feb 11, 2003 8:43 PM
Subject: Proposed FCC Changes Cost Consumers

Message sent to the following recipients:

Senator Schumer
Senator Clinton
Representative Walsh
Message text follows:

robert minich
8303 decoy run
manlius. NY 13104

February 11, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

[recipient name was inserted here],

The Federal Communications Commission is considering taking actions that will restrict consumer choice by deregulating local phone service.

Millions of Americans like me could have their phone service threatened if the local phone companies aren't required to allow competitors access to the market. I'm also concerned about the Commission's move to relieve all broadband Internet access facilities of open access obligations.

Both of these key decisions will limit my choices as a consumer by lessening competition, diminishing cost savings and threatening consumer protections. As a constituent, I urge you to support competition and open access for local phone service.

Sincerely,

robert minich

From: Robert Smith
To: Mike Powell
Date: Tue, Feb 11, 2003 1:00 PM
Subject: Linesharing

Chairman Powell:

Thank you for supporting linesharing. I hope that you will continue to fight for linesharing, access to the remote terminals, and the gradual phasing-out of UNEP.

Robert Smith

From: Russell H Hager
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Tue, Feb 11, 2003 9:42 AM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Russell H Hager (rhhager@ems.att.com) writes:

With competition finally opening up in the local Bell monopoly. Lets leave UNE-P alone and keep access charges where they should be.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: 192.128.134.68
Remote IP address 192.128.134.68

From: Sandra Braymer
To: Sandra Braymer
Date: Tue, Feb 11, 2003 7:02 PM
Subject: Proposed FCC Changes Cost Consumers

Message sent to the following recipients:

Senator Feinstein

Senator Boxer

Representative Miller

Message text follows:

Sandra Braymer
26721 Calle Maria
Mission Viejo, CA 92691-3408

February 11, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

[recipient name was inserted here]

The Federal Communications Commission is considering taking actions that will restrict consumer choice by deregulating local phone service.

Millions of Americans like me could have their phone service threatened if the local phone companies aren't required to allow competitors access to the market. I'm also concerned about the Commission's move to relieve all broadband Internet access facilities of open access obligations.

Both of these key decisions will limit my choices as a consumer by lessening competition, diminishing cost savings and threatening consumer protections. **As** a constituent, I urge you to support competition and open access for local phone service.

Sincerely,

Sandra Braymer

From: Sarah Castor
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Tue. Feb 11, 2003 1:01 PM
Subject: Competitive Telecom

Commissioner Adelstein:

Please KEEP LINESHARING INTACT. It is imperative that competition not be cut off now, giving **us**. the consumer, choices at competitive rates.

Thank you so much,

Sarah Castor

Sarah M. Castor
Strictly Commercial, Inc.
221 NE Ivanhoe Blvd.
Suite 330
Orlando, FL 32804
407.648.0330 Ofc.
407.4221273 Fax

www.strictlycommercial.com

Serving the office community in Central Florida for 13 years as an exclusive representative of the tenant's needs.

From: Shirley Gilbert
To: Shirley Gilbert
Date: Tue, Feb 11, 2003 4:19 PM
Subject: Proposed FCC Changes Cost Consumers

Message sent to the following recipients:

Senator Feinstein
Senator Boxer
Representative Radanovich
Message text follows.

Shirley Gilbert
5135 W. Fremont Ave.
Fresno. CA 93722-3696

February 11, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

[recipient name was inserted here]

The Federal Communications Commission is considering taking actions that will restrict consumer choice by deregulating local phone service.

Millions of Americans like me could have their phone service threatened if the local phone companies aren't required to allow competitors access to the market. I'm also concerned about the Commission's move to relieve all broadband Internet access facilities of open access obligations.

Both of these key decisions will limit my choices as a consumer by lessening competition, diminishing cost savings and threatening consumer protections. **As** a constituent, I urge you to support competition and open access for local phone service.

Sincerely,

Shirley Gilbert

From: Stuart Gold
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Tue. Feb 11, 2003 8:11 AM
Subject: Comments to the Commissioner

Stuart Gold (dallasthecow@netzero net) writes.

Don't get to cozy with Martin. he is a pig with lipstick. It is a necessity that linesharing be saved in order to preserve lower broadband pricing. Lower broadband pricing will lead to faster rollout which I believe was one of the FCC's goals (and is happening as we speak).

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 64.32.195.13
Remote IP address: 64.32.195.13

From: Syed khatib
To: Syed khatib
Date: Tue, Feb 11, 2003 8:10 PM
Subject: Proposed FCC Changes Cost Consumers

Message sent to the following recipients:

Senator Kennedy

Senator Kerry

Representative Markey

Message text follows:

Syed khatib
5 Russell Rd
Winchester. MA 01890-1930

February 11, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

[recipient name was inserted here],

The Federal Communications Commission is considering taking actions that will restrict consumer choice by deregulating local phone service.

Millions of Americans like me could have their phone service threatened if the local phone companies arent required to allow competitors access to the market. Im also concerned about the Commissions move to relieve all broadband Internet access facilities of open access obligations.

Both of these key decisions will limit my choices as a consumer by lessening competition, diminishing cost savings and threatening consumer protections. As a constituent, I urge you to support competition and open access for local phone service.

Sincerely,

Syed A Khatib

From: TEJL@aol.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: Tue. Feb 11, 2003 3:43 PM
Subject: Unbundled pricing/Wireline competition

Dear Mr. Powell:

Having been in the telecom industry for over twenty years I find it inconceivable that the FCC would take a stance to destroy competition in a market that is in the throws of becoming a second rate service when compared to the rest of the world. After all the local operating companies have for years been allowed to earn a rate of return based on purchases put into the rate base. By allowing this rate of return philosophy the various states and federal governments have subsidized the phone service without a great deal of consideration to what goes into that number. Now that competition is coming into play they want to take their equipment, paid for many times over by the rate payer, and lock it down so that it is impossible for a new venture to enter their market and provide services.

It hurts to say this but why not use the Japanese model --- it works for them and the penetration of Broadband at a reasonable price has been very effective though not painless. The way this should be done in the US is to allow the bells to earn a rate of return on the wire into the home. Since that has been there forever the depreciated cost to the RBOC's cannot be that high. Any return on that facility should be pretty much gravy. Allow a greater price on the shared facility. That is a reasonable request from the competitors perspective since they will not have to build out that facility. This can be done while still allowing this country the opportunity to bring its telecommunications networks up to the standards of the other countries of the world. If something is not done then your legacy will be one that describes the demise of US superiority in communications and thus a decline in the quality of life in this country.

The following Business Week commentary is telling.

The story of broadband provides a telling contrast between what has gone wrong in the US telecommunications business since the passage of the 1996 Telecommunications Act -- and what has gone right in Asia. In the US, the Bells invested billions in broadband just as venture capitalists funded numerous DSL startups -- creating huge excess capacity. The Bells' debt ballooned, in part because of their broadband investments, and most DSL startups hit the skids: Even the largest independent DSL provider in the US -- Covad Communications -- had to endure a restructuring while in bankruptcy protection, which it exited in 2001. US consumers have borne the brunt of such miscalculations: The average American household with broadband now pays \$45 a month -- expensive enough to slow growth in sign-ups.

Asian telecom companies, by contrast, arrived at the party relatively late, and partly by luck avoided most of the excesses that have vexed their US counterparts. Thus, established carriers in Asia have cashed in on the broadband craze without blowing through nearly as much money as the Bells did -- even as broadband entrepreneurs have done well enough that some have a chance to prosper. For instance, eAccess is profitable on the basis of EBTIDA -- earnings before taxes, interest, depreciation, and amortization. "We are the first competitive local exchange carrier (CLEC) in the world to hit that mark," Semmoto boasts.

GOOD TIMING. The biggest winners, though, may be Asian consumers. In many instances, they get DSL access that's 10 to 20 times as fast as that in the U.S. -- for as little as \$20 a month. And they've jumped at the bargain: South Korea boasts the highest broadband penetration of any nation, at 58% of households.

Asia's good timing will probably pay off for years to come. *By the time Asian companies got serious about broadband they could buy much better gear for as little as 20% of what their US counterparts paid.* That accounts for their faster Net access and lower prices -- and quicker adoption by Asian consumers. That in turn has spurred online gaming, which has caught on faster in Asia than in the US -- and helped carriers recoup their infrastructure investments. High urban densities helped hold down those investments, since high-rise networks are cheaper to build than those that span US suburbs.

In many instances, regulation in Asia has also been friendlier to entrepreneurs -- and kept the big state monopolies honest. In South Korea, owners of the large apartment blocks that house 40% of the population also control the telecom equipment in their buildings. That has given upstart carriers an opening, since they can negotiate deals directly with landlords instead of going through Korea Telecom. Thus, the country's leading independent DSL provider -- Hanaro -- has been able **so** far to compete head-to-head with both Korea Telecom and cable-TV providers. And unlike in the US, the big companies aren't hurting. Of the 10 most profitable major telecoms worldwide in 2002, seven were in Asia, according to the International Telecommunications Union.

TORRID SIGN-UPS. In Japan, Semmoto says, the government has enforced regulations that require incumbent phone companies to give new competitors such as eAccess capacity in their central switching facilities at reasonable rates. In the US, by contrast, the Bells and upstart carriers traded lawsuits over such arrangements -- and companies such as Covad (COVD) now accuse the Bells of throwing up roadblocks that impaired their businesses.

The most telling evidence of Asia's advantage may be what happens next. In the US, broadband subscriber growth logged 59% last year as carriers have kept prices high to turn a profit. In Asia, where household incomes are significantly lower, the sign-up rate remains torrid (though from a much lower **base**). As of last June, China had well under 1 million DSL subscribers. By January, 2003, it had close to 3 million, making it the fastest-growing broadband sector of any country in the world. In Japan, the tally has reached 6 million after only four years of serious marketing -- and may reach 12 million by 2004, according to Yankee Group.

Better technology also means bigger revenue opportunities than online gaming. Korea Telecom serves Net-based software for a fee via broadband links to small businesses, an idea that **so** far has failed in the US "We have enough people on the systems and fast enough networks that the application-service-provider model works even though it didn't in the US," says Sang-Hoon Lee, Korea Telecom's chief technology officer.

"VERY THREATENED." Of course, Asia's phone carriers could still face big problems. The broadband companies have started to offer Internet phone service, for example, forcing the incumbents to face a Faustian choice of ultimately embracing that technology and cannibalizing their still-lucrative phone monopolies or mounting a rear-guard action. "Nippon Telegraph & Telephone in Japan is very threatened with the introduction of Internet telephony," says Izumi Aizu, a principal at Tokyo-based consulting firm Asia Network Research. "They know that the good old days are gone."

No one said the transition to a broadband world would be painless, however. And the situation could be a lot worse: Had they been just a little faster on their feet, Asian companies might have landed on the same treadmill as their US cousins.

From: Theresa Garrett
To: Theresa Garrett
Date: Tue, Feb 11.2003 2:48 PM
Subject: Proposed FCC Changes Cost Consumers

Message sent to the following recipients:

Senator Sarbanes

Senator Mikulski

Representative Gilchrest

Message text follows:

Theresa Garrett
9523 Horn Avenue
Baltimore, MD 21236-1523

February 11, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

[recipient name was inserted here],

The Federal Communications Commission is considering taking actions that will restrict consumer choice by deregulating local phone service.

Millions of Americans like me could have their phone service threatened if the local phone companies aren't required to allow competitors access to the market. I'm also concerned about the Commission's move to relieve all broadband Internet access facilities of open access obligations.

Both of these key decisions will limit my choices as a consumer by lessening competition, diminishing cost savings and threatening consumer protections. As a constituent, I urge you to support competition and open access for local phone service.

Sincerely

Theresa Garrett

From: Thomas Waters
To: Thomas Waters
Date: Tue, Feb 11, 2003 3:41 PM
Subject: Proposed FCC Changes Cost Consumers

Message sent to the following recipients:

Senator Hutchison

Senator Cornyn

Representative Rodriguez

Message text follows:

Thomas Waters
1228 North Blvd
Universal City, TX 78148-3519

February 11, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

[recipient name was inserted here],

The Federal Communications Commission is considering taking actions that will restrict consumer choice by deregulating local phone service.

Millions of Americans like me could have their phone service threatened if the local phone companies aren't required to allow competitors access to the market. I'm also concerned about the Commission's move to relieve all broadband Internet access facilities of open access obligations.

Both of these key decisions will limit my choices as a consumer by lessening competition, diminishing cost savings and threatening consumer protections. **As** a constituent, I urge you to support competition and open access for local phone service.

Sincerely,

Thomas J. Waters

From: Walter Fessenden
To: Walter Fessenden
Date: Tue, Feb 11, 2003 4:59 PM
Subject: Proposed FCC Changes Cost Consumers

Message to the following recipients:

Senator Dole

Message text follows:

Walter Fessenden
105 Harvester Dr
Holly Springs, NC 27540

February 11, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

[recipient name was inserted here],

The Federal Communications Commission is considering taking actions that will restrict consumer choice by deregulating local phone service.

Millions of Americans like me could have their phone service threatened if the local phone companies aren't required to allow competitors access to the market. I'm also concerned about the Commission's move to relieve all broadband Internet access facilities of open access obligations.

Both of these key decisions will limit my choices as a consumer by lessening competition, diminishing cost savings and threatening consumer protections. As a constituent, I urge you to support competition and open access for local phone service

Sincerely,

Walter A. Fessenden

From: Willard Campbell
To: Willard Campbell
Date: Tue, Feb 11, 2003 2:50 PM
Subject: Proposed FCC Changes Cost Consumers

Message sent to the following recipients:

Senator Feinstein
Senator Boxer
Representative Lantos
Message text follows:

Willard Campbell
2012 New Brunswick Drive
San Mateo, CA 944024019

February 11, 2003

[recipient address was inserted here]

[recipient name was inserted here]

The Federal Communications Commission is considering taking actions that will restrict consumer choice by deregulating local phone service.

Millions of Americans like me could have their phone service threatened if the local phone companies aren't required to allow competitors access to the market. I'm also concerned about the Commission's move to relieve all broadband Internet access facilities of open access obligations.

Both of these key decisions will limit my choices as a consumer by lessening competition, diminishing cost savings and threatening consumer protections. As a constituent, I urge you to support competition and open access for local phone service.

Sincerely,

Willard H. Campbell